

The Principia.

First Principles in Religion, Morals, Government, and the Economy of Life.

VOL. II.—No. 5.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1860.

WHOLE NUMBER, 57.

The Principia

Published Weekly, at 339 Pearl Street, (two doors above
Hoyt's Buildings) New-York.

WILLIAM GOODSELL, Editor.

SAMUEL WILDE, Proprietor.

TERMS: One Dollar a year, in advance.

Direct business letters, with remittances, to

MELANCTHON B. WILLIAMS, Publishing Agent,

as above.

PROSPECTUS.

Our object, by this publication, is to promote pure religion, sound morals, and the abolition of slaveholding, caste, the sum-trading, and all other crimes—the application of Christian principles to all the relations, domestic and foreign, of the human race;—to the individual, the family, the Church, the State, the Nation—to the work of converting the world to God, restoring the common brotherhood of man, and rendering Society the type of heaven. Our text book is the Bible; our standard, the Divine law; our expediency, obedience; our plan, the Gospel; our trust, the Divine promise; our pasoply, the whole armor of God.

—Editors friendly, please copy, or notice.

THE BIBLE ABOLITIONIST;

Containing the Testimony of the Scriptures against Slavery, and the Scriptural method of treating it.

"To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Isa. viii. 20. "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for correction, for instruction in righteousness. That the man of God might be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." II. Tim. iii. 16-17.

Part II.—Of Slavery—its Nature and Character, as Defined and Described by the Slave States themselves.

CHAPTER I.

ITS CARDINAL PRINCIPLE; HUMAN CHATTLEHOOD, PROPERTY IN MAN—WORKINGS OF THE PRINCIPLE.

What is slavery? It is the Slavery existing in America, that we are considering. Its definition is to be found in its own Code—its statutes, its judicial decisions, its characteristic usages and customs.

ITS CARDINAL PRINCIPLE—HUMAN CHATTLEHOOD.

"A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs."—Louisiana Civil Code (Art. 35). "The slave is entirely subject to the will of his master."—(Ib. Art. 173). "Slaves shall be deemed, sold, taken, reputed and adjudged in law to be chattels personal, in the hands of their owners and possessors, and their executors, administrators, and assigns, to all intents, constructions and purposes whatsoever." (Law of South Carolina, 2. Brevard's Digest, 229. Prince's Digest, 446. &c.)

"The cardinal principle of slavery, that the slave is not to be ranked among sentient beings but among things, as an article of property, a chattel personal, obtains as undoubted law, in all of these States."—Stroud's Sketch. (p. 23.)

"It is plain that the dominion of the master is as unlimited as that which is tolerated by the laws of any civilized country in relation to brute animals, to quadrupeds, to use the words of the civil law." (Ib. p. 24.)

This is no obsolete statute—no dead letter. It is sustained by the Courts, enforced by the executive officers, and carried out in all the details of daily business, among slaveholders. On no other tenure than this, is any American slave held.

THOMAS JEFFERSON, in his letter to Gov. Coles of Illinois says—"Few minds have yet doubted that they (the slaves) were as legitimate subjects of property as their horses or cattle."

HENRY CLAY, in his celebrated speech in the U. S. Senate, in 1839, said—"I know that there is a visionary dogma which holds that negro slaves cannot be the subjects of property. I shall not dwell on this speculative abstraction. That is property which the law declares to be property. Two hundred years of legislation have sanctioned and sanctified negro slaves as property."

Thus the Bible account of the creation, common brotherhood, and dignity of man, is set aside as a "speculative abstraction." Two hundred years of pro-slavery "legislation" have "sanctioned and sanctified" the blasphemy! This is slavery, and these are its pretensions. Yet there are learned teachers of religion who profess to find their warranty for

American Slavery in the Bible! What ideas can they have received from their Bibles concerning God; the Father of all men, and the supremacy of his law? What ideas concerning man, his moral accountability, personality, and moral freedom? What ideas can they have of these, and of a state of probation for man, if man may be held as a slave, a chattel personal, a thing, a beast, "entirely subject to the will of a master to whom he belongs?" Can anything be more certain than that "the cardinal principle" of slavery is a bold denial of all the leading truths of religion, as taught in the Bible? "All souls are mine" says Jehovah. (Ezekiel, 18: 4) Of every American slaveholder the pretended owner says—"Nay! but this soul is mine." This is the very essence of his claim, and the moment he relinquishes it, in such a form that the civil law can take cognizance of the relinquishment, that moment his claim expires, and the slave is free.

WORKINGS OF THE PRINCIPLE.

The whole system of American slavery, with the legislation and jurisprudence that support it, and the usages sustained by them, grow out of the "cardinal principle" of human chattelhood, already described. From that principle the entire system, in theory and practice, is deduced. Any controverted question in the Courts, is decided by referring it to that principle.

1. *Slave and mortgage of slaves.*—As a chattel personal, the slave is a subject of mortgage, barter, and sale. As a chattel he may be seized and sold at auction, for the debts of his "owner," or for the settlement of his estate, after his decease. As chattels, the slaves are transmitted by inheritance or by will, to heirs at law, or legatees. In the distribution of estates they are distributed and separated like other property, like beasts, without regard to ties affinity and kindred. As property, they may be used, absolutely, by their owners, for their own profit, or pleasure. Slave women, being chattels may be used, either as beasts of burden, or as "breeders" of human "stock" or to gratify their master's lusts, and the Slave Code affords them no protection nor redress. No public sentiment, either in the community or in the Church, mitigates this feature of the slave system.

2. *Slaves can possess nothing.*—Being property themselves; they can own no property, nor make any contract.

Slaves cannot marry.—Being held as property, and incapable of making any contract, they cannot contract any marriage recognized by law.

3. *Slaves cannot constitute families.*—Being held as chattels personal, they can have no claim on each other, in the relations of husband and wife, parent and child; no security from separation by sale; no marital rights, no parental rights, no family culture, no family government, no family order, no family education, no family protection, no family chastity. If marriage and the family relation be essential to virtue, then slavery is at war with virtue. If marriage and the family relation are of God, if they are institutions of the Bible, then slavery is an institution of Satan, in opposition to the Bible.

4. *Labor without wages.*—The relation of master to slave, being the relation of an owner to a chattel, is incompatible with the Heaven-established relation of labor and wages. The slave can receive no wages, because he can make no contract, and also because he, himself, and all that he earns or possesses, belongs not to himself, but to his owner. If the owner should promise him wages, the promise would not be held to be legally binding. Should the stipulated sum be paid into the hand of the slave, he would not be the possessor. The slave and all that he has, belongs to his master.

5. *"The slave, as he can possess nothing, can acquire nothing but what must belong to his master"* (Civil Code, Art. 35.)

"They cannot take, by purchase or descent." "Slaves have no legal rights in things, real or personal; but whatever they may acquire, belongs, in point of law, to their masters."—(Stroud, pp. 25-45.) "Slaves can make no contract"—(Ib. 25, 61.) "Slaves are incapable of inheriting or transmitting property." [Civil Code, Art. 945.]

Now contrast this with the Bible. "The laborer is worthy of his hire." [Luke 10, 7.] "Wo unto him that useth his neighbors service without wages, and giveth him not for his work." [Jer. 22, 13.] "And I will come near to you, to judgment, and I will be a swift witness against the scorers, and against the adulterers, and against the false swearers, and against them that oppress the hireling in his wages, the widow, and the fatherless, and that turn aside the stranger from his right, and fear not me, saith the Lord of hosts." [Mat. 23, 5.] "Go, ye now, weep and howl, for your miseries that shall come upon you." * * "Behold, the hire of your laborers who have reaped down your fields, which is of you kept back by fraud, crieth, and the cries of them which have reaped are entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth." [James 5. 1-4.]

6. *The slave is unprotected.*—The slave, being the absolute property of the owner, is wholly in his power, without any effectual restraint.

"It is an inflexible and universal rule of slave law, founded in one or two states upon usage, in others sanctioned by express legislation, that the testimony of a colored person, whether bond or free, cannot be received against a white person."—(Stroud's Sketch, p. 27.)

It follows that, in the absence of a white witness, any outrage may, with impunity, be perpetrated upon a slave.

"The master is not liable to an indictment for a battery committed upon a slave."—(Wheeler's Law of Slavery, p. 244.)

In the case of *The State vs. Mann*, Dec. 7, 1829 [2 Devereaux's North Carolina Reports, 263] Judge Ruffin said:

"The question is whether a cruel and unreasonable battery upon a slave, by the hirer, is indictable." * * * "That he is so liable, has never been decided, nor so far as is known, has hitherto been contended. There have been no prosecutions of this sort. The established and uniform practice of the country in this respect is the best evidence of the portion of power deemed by the whole community, requisite to the preservation of the master's dominion. If we thought differently, we could not set our notions in array against the judgement of everybody else, and say that this or that authority may be safely lopped off." * * * "The power of the master must be absolute, to render the submission of the slave perfect. I most freely confess my sense of the harshness of the proposition." * * * "But there is no remedy. This discipline belongs to the state of slavery." "We cannot allow the right of the master to be brought into discussion, in a Court of justice. The slave, to remain a slave, must be made sensible that there is no appeal from his master, that his person is in no instance, usurped, but is conferred by the laws of man, at least, if not by the laws of God."

Under such a system it is manifest that even statutes against murder must, in the case of the slave, become a dead letter. And such is the almost universal fact. How does this feature of American slavery compare with the Bible?

"And surely your blood of your lives will I require, at the hand of every beast will I require it, and at the hand of man, and at the hand of every man's brother will I require the life of man. Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed, for in the image of God made he man." Gen. 9: 5-6. "He that smiteth a man, that he die, he shall surely be put to death." Ex. 21: 12. "And if a man smite the eye of his servant, or the eye of his maid, that it perish, he shall let him go free, for his eye's sake. And if he smite out his man-servant's tooth, or his maid-servant's tooth, he shall let him go free for his tooth's sake." Ex. 21: 26-27. "If I did despise the cause of my man-servant or of my maid-servant, when they contended with me, what shall I then do when God riseth up, and when he visiteth, what

shall I answer him?" Job 31: 13-14. "One law shall be to him that is home-born, and unto the stranger that sojourneth among you." Ex. 9: 49. "Thou shalt not wrest the judgment of thy poor in his cause." Ex. 23: 6.

The law of God, in the Bible, requires the equal and impartial protection of the persons and of the personal rights of all men, without distinction, making no difference between masters and servants, rich and poor, white and colored, natives and foreigners. The Slave Code is the exact reverse of all this. So that if the Bible be from God then slavery must be from the arch enemy of God and of mankind.

For the Principia.
NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY.

NO. XXII.

The right of independent thinking is the right of every man. Freely exercised on the subject of government, it is the dreaded foe of despotism. If you would establish despotism, restrain this right, and bring the people to a habit of borrowing their sentiments on government from those who claim to be their superiors. The unperverted popular sentiment always favors liberty. No people will vote slavery, if it is to be decided by lot, who shall be the slaves, and who the masters. Slavery never was and never will be established by a free exercise of popular sovereignty in which all are equally at liberty to vote, and equally liable to the consequences. He who favors slavery intends that others and not himself shall be its victims. In all cases, slavery is that abuse of power against weakness, which it is the mission of government to prevent. The Federal Constitution expresses the popular sentiment of the nation at the time of its adoption. It is just such an instrument as a people might adopt for their own common benefit and security, and not at all like one which a portion of them might devise for oppressing another portion. It is the rule by which they chose to govern and be governed, and by which they intended to keep the government in their own hands. If any of them entertained a purpose of reversing the legitimate use of government by making it support ruffianly power against weakness, that purpose was contradicted by the instrument. It is, however, sought to make the Constitution serve such a purpose. But its own language interposes a "difficulty." If it is assumed to mean just what it says, and all whom the sovereign people appoint to administer it, are lost to their own independent judgment of its meaning, what are the prospects of despotism? Hence the clumsy device of having nine men, judges of the Supreme Court, explain the Constitution, and having all the rest of the people's servants learn its meaning through them. What is the plea for this monopoly of exposition? A writer on the Government of the United States gives us the following information—

"One important object of a Supreme Court of the United States, is, that a uniform meaning or interpretation may be given to the Constitution and laws of the United States.

One Court may decide a law to be Constitutional, another may declare it to be unconstitutional. In one State the Constitution may be taken to mean one thing, in another quite another thing. But when the case comes before the Supreme Court, and is there decided, such decision governs the judgment of all inferior courts throughout the Union."

The argument of this extract is plausible enough to satisfy confiding people who do not understand the necessity of watching jealously against judicial usurpation. But we may reply to it that if the Constitution is interpreted as other instruments are required to be, it admits of very little, if any, diversity of interpretation. No material diversity can be made, except by forcing upon it constructions which its language rejects. Such constructions are not interpretations but falsifications. The Constitution itself would harmonize all courts disposed to administer it according to its own intent, the establishment of justice. On the other hand, a decision of the Supreme Court has been known to be so vague or ambiguous, as to feed an interpretation by some other court, in order that lawyers might agree in their understanding of it. Who authorized the Supreme Court to impose upon inferior courts a submissive acquiescence in its interpretations? Not the Constitution. That court has no more authority to interpret the Constitution for Congress or for State Legislatures than for inferior courts. Jefferson in writing to a friend about a book, said:

"You seem, in pages 34 and 148, to consider the judges as

the ultimate arbiters of all constitutional questions, a very dangerous doctrine indeed, and one which would place us under the despotism of an oligarchy. Our judges are as honest as other men and not more so. They have, with others, the same passions for party, for power, and the privileges of their corps. Their maxim is "*boni judicis est ampliare jurisdictionem*," and their power the more dangerous as they are in office for life, and not responsible, as the functionaries are, to the elective control. The Constitution has erected no such single tribunal, knowing that to whatever hands confided, with the corruptions of time and party, its members would become despots. It has more wisely made all departments co-equal and co-sovereign within themselves."

I. S.

*See a speech of Mr. Conkling in the House of Representatives of Congress, April 17, 1860.

For the Principia.
MR. GIDDINGS ON NEGRO SUFFRAGE.

Mr. Giddings writes to the *Ashtabula Sentinel* on the question of negro suffrage:

"I have always opposed introducing into the Republican platform any doubtful issue. The right of suffrage is not a natural right. God never gave the right of suffrage, or of holding office, to an infant who never dreamed of voting or holding office. Yet He has given the infant and the female a right to live, and we hang a man for murdering infants or females, precisely as for murdering men; we protect the negro precisely as we protect our wives, our children; ourselves; for the law of Ohio that protects my life and liberty, protect that of the negro to precisely the same extent."

Mr. Giddings claims to be a Republican, on principle, and professes to base his opposition to slavery on higher grounds than those which influence ordinary politicians. He can regard the question of negro suffrage in the light of a "doubtful issue," only on the ground of expediency.

Mr. Giddings's reasoning does not materially differ from that of the slaveholders. The slaveholder says, because I supply the physical wants of my slaves, and because I am bound, by law, to take care of them in sickness and old age; therefore, I have a right to hold and treat them as property, to deny to them the rights of education, manhood marriage, and everything that makes life desirable.

Mr. Giddings says, because the laws in some of the States protect the negro in some of his rights; therefore, it is no crime to rob him of all those rights not secured to him by law. The granting to the negro his natural rights, purchases the privilege of justly denying to him all other rights. It is not easy to show wherein this logic of Mr. Giddings when carried to its final results, differs materially from the maxim of Henry Clay, that "what the law makes property is property." The negro is at the bottom of the well, surrounded by the cold damps of death; the theory of Mr. Giddings is, that, in order to get him raised up near to the top, where the air is more pure, where he can open his eyes to the partial light of day, and feel to some extent, the genial heat of the sun, it must be affirmed: as a dogma, that he should not be lifted entirely out of the well, and have his feet placed on terra firma, where he can snuff the inspiring blast, and be warmed into a vigorous life, by the direct rays of the sun; or at least, that this is a "doubtful issue."

Mr. Giddings was the very man, who, in the Chicago Convention, very properly insisted on having engrafted into the Republican Platform, the extract from the Declaration of Independence, "that all men are created equal," that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." Now, Mr. Giddings will admit, that the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness includes and carries with it, the right to use the means necessary to maintain and perpetuate these blessings; and he will recognize the right of suffrage as among the most important of these means, especially, when he assents to the latter clause of the above extract, "that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

It cannot be assumed that Mr. Giddings regards the question of "negro suffrage" a "doubtful issue," on the ground that a negro is not a man. Upon what principle of justice does he deny to the negro, being a native American, the

right of suffrage, which he cordially extends to foreigners, (including the colored Japanese), from every country of the Globe, (except Africa,) all the franchises of an American citizen, after a brief probation? We are unwilling to believe that Mr. Giddings has not risen above the mean, wicked prejudice, engendered by slavery, which proscribes a free colored American, simply because he is colored.

Slavery in the Territories cannot be an evil of such magnitude, as to call for a great political party, the chief plank in whose platform, is resistance to its extension into the Territories: while that branch of it, which extends over, into the free States, and governs the colored man without his consent, and takes from him the right of suffrage, is no evil, or at most, only a "doubtful issue." Oppression of the African in the free States, is more wicked and inconsistent than in the slave States, and most wicked of all; in the case of professed philanthropists. How can Mr. Giddings expect the slaveholder to make the great pecuniary sacrifice involved in emancipating his slaves, while, he, Mr. G., treats the negro suffrage as a doubtful issue? "He that is unjust in the least is also unjust in much."

REMARKS.—Our correspondent's argument for negro suffrage, is a conclusive one. But when Mr. Giddings comes to read the allusion to his "claims" of being a "Republican on principle," we can imagine him claiming that the Republican party is, par excellence, the "white man's party," so that color is an essential principle of his party. Again, Mr. Giddings, insisting on the incorporation into the platform of the Republican party, of the extract quoted from the Declaration of Independence, was no more inconsistent, with his language concerning negro suffrage, than with the promise in that platform, not to interfere with slavery in the States. To expect or to ask consistency of one who could adopt that platform, and vote for a Presidential candidate pledged to slave catching, was asking too much, we fear, for Mr. Giddings to concede. Our correspondent's article we hope, will do good, in more ways than one.

DR. CHEEVER'S "BRITISH AID MISSION" FOR THE CHURCH OF THE PURITANS—WHAT IS THOUGHT OF IT IN GREAT BRITAIN.

We continue our extracts from the *Glasgow Examiner*. Last week we gave the sentiments of the speakers at the great meeting in Glasgow. We now add the editorial of the *Examiner*.

DR. CHEEVER'S RECEPTION AND PROGRESS IN GLASGOW.

This esteemed author and preacher has reason to be satisfied with the reception he has met with in Glasgow. Not only at the public meeting on Wednesday, but everywhere he has been most cordially received, and the resolutions of the committees of the New Association for the Abolition of Slavery passed by a full meeting on Thursday, must be exceedingly satisfactory to him. In New York he can scarcely utter his uncompromising testimony without raising a set of horns about his ears; and their half-dozen sympathizers in Glasgow would fain grumble, but must feel it rather a hopeless endeavor. The speech of the Doctor on Wednesday evening was a great success, both as a literary effort, and as a thorough exposure of slavery and its abettors. The audience felt a deeper horror of the whole system of slavery than ever, and more surprised that such a system should have the sanction of the churches and clergy of nearly all denominations in the United States. All we have seen, have expressed their determination to support Dr. Cheever both by their sympathy and money. The preaching of the Doctor excited a wide interest in his behalf. His sermon in the forenoon was one of the most powerful and pathetic ever delivered in the city, and his statement in the evening aroused the great congregation against American slavery and its protectors. It will be observed that on Sabbath (tomorrow) he is to occupy the pulpit of the Rev. Dr. Buchanan (Free College Church) in the forenoon, and the pulpit of the Rev. Mr. Calderwood (Greyfriars U. P. Church) in the evening, and on Tuesday at mid-day he is to address a meeting in the Merchants' Hall. All who have seen the Doctor express their wonder at his mild, manly, and dignified appearance. According to his enemies, he is an insupportable, passionate, violent declaimer; but he turns out to be one of the most philosophical and graceful speakers of his time. The fact that his enemies have so misrepresented his appearance and oratory, throws doubts on all their other allegations, as this is a matter in which one's senses contradict his maligners. We hope the Doctor will arrange with some of our eminent publishers to bring out a fresh edition of some of his charming volumes, as many would now read that never heard of them before. It is well that when he is losing friends in New York he is gaining friends elsewhere. He feelingly alluded to one, formerly his intimate friend, (assumed to be Henry Ward Beecher) who now gives him the cold shoulder. This is just what was stated at the Cheever demonstration in Glasgow in March last, which was

turn out to be true to the letter. Let our wealthy men teach these miserable protesters in New York, that Dr. Cheever can be and will be sustained, independent of their doubtful and blood-stained dollars.

REV. DR. CHEEVER IN GLASGOW CITY HALL.

Parties who remember the state of feeling in Glasgow thirty years ago will not be surprised that such views as those advocated by Dr. Cheever should be unpopular in New York. Thirty years ago, the speech delivered by Dr. Cheever in the City Hall, on Wednesday night, would have been hissed in the same place. The slaveholding power, even in Glasgow, was so strong, at that time, that clergymen who preached or prayed against slavery were marked men, just as Dr. Cheever is, at this moment, the butt of the slaveholding power in America. It is probably only what might be expected, when we read of the persecution of such a man as Dr. Cheever in the capital of a country where slavery is sanctioned. If, when Britain held slaves in her remotest colonies, the influence of slave traders was sufficient to exert a disastrous influence in Glasgow society, it is not marvellous that, in New York, the slaveholding power will be in the ascendant. Indeed, in considering the state of American society, it will occur to many that the marvel is not that Dr. Cheever should be annoyed and persecuted; but that he should be able to maintain at once his position and testimony. It is to be noticed that in America, the joint action of ecclesiastical bodies has, till now, all been in favor of slavery in certain circumstances. The resolutions of the chief Church Courts all leave sufficient protection for slaveholders in all their civil and ecclesiastical rights. Think then of the effect produced in a fashionable church in a fashionable part of New York, by the minister standing up and, Sabbath after Sabbath, denouncing slaveholding *per se*, as a sin—the sin of America—and demanding the immediate abolition of slavery.

The views of Dr. Cheever as severely rebuke ecclesiastical men as slaveholders, for he declares that if the ministers of religion throughout America had done their duty towards the poor slave, slavery would have been abolished long ago, and the means adopted by John Brown and others would never have been required. Dr. Cheever is the best abused minister in all America and his terrible denunciations of slavery, as uttered in the City Hall, are quite enough to provoke the hostility with which he is so bitterly assailed. He takes his stand on the Bible—on the inalienable rights of man, and declares slaveholders man-stealers, whatever may be their position in Church and State. Even in his own congregation he has had to struggle with the domestic institution. He seems to have in his church very unscrupulous men, who adopt very mean expedients to harass him, and the pity is that in this country there should be found men mean enough and silly enough to aid and abet these parties, because such may forward their mercantile interests. Probably there never has been anything published more disgracefully impudent than the protest of these men—a protest that is its own best answer—that contradicts itself in every paragraph—a protest which any man of ordinary sagacity will see to be the work of unscrupulous malice and ignorant assumption. Dr. Cheever is far more than a match for them, in every respect. Even were his case as bad as theirs, he has intellectual ability to make the worse appear the better reason. But the position of the Doctor is so simple and intelligible that it needs no sophistry to defend it. He is persecuted because he denounces American slavery, and demands that the Christian Church at once purge itself from all connection with slaveholders and their abettors. He refused to admit any mitigation or palliation in the case of any American slaveholders, but declares them all man-stealers, and ranked in the Holy Book with fratricides and matricides. "Not so fast" say his brethren in the ministry—"Not so fast" say the American papers—American slavery is not slavery at all—it is merely a domestic institution perpetuated for the good of the slave, and for the preservation of order and good morals. And to work these moderate persons set, and gave Dr. Cheever notice to quit, and do all they can to stop the supplies to compel a surrender; and when the Doctor appeals to British society, the enemies shout out "Don't help him—foreign interference in the internal affairs of a church is not allowed—we are quite able to meet all expenses in the church of the Puritans." Never was an exposure more complete than that made of these parties, by Dr. Cheever. He truly represented them as besieging a garrison, and shouting that no foreign aid was needed, and that they were quite able to feed the garrison themselves (though meantime they were endeavouring to try it with the starvation process). Dr. Cheever not only demolished his miserable foes, but vindicated all that his friends said in his behalf at the Cheever demonstration in Glasgow. The Rev. Mr. Batchelor, on whom the vindication of Dr. Cheever devolved at that meeting, reasserted all he then stated as strictly true, and fully justified by previous and consequent events. The Rev. Wm. Arnot gave a very graphic view of Dr. Cheever and his position by his kite illustration—the proper material—the firm fixing—the brisk opposition gales, and the kite rose aloft—rose by the very means that seem to put it down. The Rev. Mr. Calderwood and the Rev. Dr. Symington spoke well in behalf of Dr. Cheever and in behalf of the slave, and expressed their confidence that this country had both sympathy and money for Dr. Cheever—even as much as wanted. His foes both here and across the water will, we presume, be thrown on their beam ends by the meeting of Wednesday.

The Doctor's triumph in Scotland will be complete. He finds that he is in the land of the brave and the free, who never owned a slave.

We might say that he was all right with the people before his arrival in Britain, and it was only a very small section of rather doubtful friends of the slave that continued to cherish any unfriendly or antagonistic feelings towards him. For a time—a very short time only—did misrepresentation succeed in shaking confidence in his policy, and in preventing the flow of that public sympathy and aid of which he stood so much in need, and to which he was so well entitled. Impartial inquiry very speedily cleared up the matter, and the means which have been so pertinaciously used to defame him will only tend to exalt him in the esteem of the Christian community, and stimulate them to contribute pecuniary support with a more liberal hand. The case is now known in its full merits, and Dr. Cheever's conduct, in keeping up not merely a desultory but a regular and systematic fire against the iniquitous system of slavery, has received the approval of the most eminent evangelical ministers in this country. It is certainly high time that the local instigators of the opposition should sink as quietly as possible into that silence and oblivion from which it was their misfortune to emerge even for a very little season. In that direction evidently lie their missions and their interests, and out of it they make a very small and sorry figure indeed. The meeting on Wednesday evening, attended as it was by ministers of various denominations, and by a very large assemblage of the public, was unequivocal testimony in favour of the principles on which Dr. Cheever and that great majority of his congregation have acted with regard to the question of slavery. It showed also the utter powerlessness of his enemies to materially injure him in the estimation of the Christian community of this country. The only charge that can be brought against him is that abhorrence of slavery is so sincere that his labours are calculated to produce practical effects. His enemies cry peace, peace, on a subject on which there should be no peace till the chains of the bondsmen are wrenched asunder, and the oppressed set free. The address of Dr. Cheever on this occasion, was in all respects excellent. He showed that on one point alone, that of separating children from their parents, and husbands from their wives, the system was altogether inhuman as well as unchristian, and that no considerations of state policy, or any amount of theological perversion, or metaphysical sophistry, could make it anything else. There is only one way in which the system can be honestly advocated or apologised for, and that is in the way of the slaveholder's pecuniary interests. The abolition of slavery involves the sacrifice of much valuable property, and property in the eyes of the slaveholders is much more sacred than human life, human liberty, or even the principles of Christianity.

GARIBALDI THE VICTOR.

Every body can praise Garibaldi, now that he is victorious. Had he failed of success, who would have given him credit for the noble qualities he exhibited? Look at the following:

"The Africa brings us news of one of the most remarkable events in history. It can be told in a very few words. A man who, a few years ago, was making candles on Staten Island—who, a few months ago, was a retired soldier, much beloved and admired, but with no position or command—by his daring, his address, and his military skill has rescued a kingdom and a dependent island from a tyrannic dynasty—has been made absolute dictator in the realm which he enfranchised, and then summoning a sovereign who has not furnished him a gun, a man, or a scudo, rides with him side by side into the capital of the liberated country, transfers to him the supreme power, and, finally, not lingering round the monarch in whose hands he has placed the scepter of half Italy, goes home to rest as quietly as if he were turning his back upon a day's labor.

"There is a simple grandeur about the manner in which this man Garibaldi had absolved himself of the high and perilous office which, all unbidden, he assumed, that lifts him far up among those who sit enthroned in the world's memory. Such absolute self-assertion when he was dictating the fortunes of his country, such absolute self-negation when those fortunes were achieved by the force of his will, and the strength of his right arm, mankind can think of only with wonder and admiration. But yesterday he was absolute, at peril of his life, his fortune and his fame; to-day he gives his power, not back again to those who, in sheer necessity, bestowed it on him—that were comparatively easy—but into the hands of another man, with the sole purpose of serving their common country.

"It is neither exaggeration nor error to say that Garibaldi has done all this; for, in spite of the condition of affairs in Italy, without him it would not, could not have been done. It would be poorly urged in diminution of his glory, that where he has left order there before was chaos, that the air which he has left ringing with the cheers of grateful freemen, was, before he breathed it, resounding with the groans and curses of the exasperated victims of oppression. The Italians may well cry, long live Garibaldi, and the world's eye brim brightly with the flood of feeling, as it follows him silently seeking his island home of Caprera."—*The World*.

Suppose Garibaldi had been a colored man, or a white

John Brown, and had done for the American Slave States what Garibaldi has done for the Italian States, "enfranchising" the subjects of "despotism." Would "The World" celebrate the "moral grandeur" of the achievement? Probably it would, if it were popular to do so.

"Garibaldi has resigned his dictatorship into the hands of Victor Emanuel, and gone home to his rude farm on the little island of Caprera. After uniting Sicily and Naples, with their nine millions of people, to the Italian Kingdom, the liberator returns to the simplicity of his peaceful seclusion, refusing both wealth and titles, enriched in nothing but glory, and the mingled admiration and affection of the world. If history records anywhere the life of a hero more disinterested, more brave, more faithful, endowed with more substantial magnanimity or a more sublime simplicity of character, we do not know it. Italy may well look upon him with pride and gratitude, but he belongs to humanity even more than he belongs to her."—*Tribune*.

Garibaldi did not content himself with attempting to limit the spread of "despotism," letting it alone in Italy, where it existed.

RESULTS OF WEST INDIA EMANCIPATION.

A Deputation was lately sent to the West Indies by the English Baptist Missionary Society, to report upon the condition of the people and the missionary work. The deputation met the Committee in London, Oct. 11, 1860, and gave some account of the state of things in Jamaica.

On the results of emancipation, they thus speak:—"Its success is beyond doubt, and the results may well encourage the ardent efforts of the friends of Africa to seek the destruction of slavery throughout the world."

As to the religious condition of the churches and people, they report:—

"It was not possible to be otherwise than grateful to God for the extent and influence of religious knowledge in all parts of the native community. Judged by the numerous places of worship, visible on the mountain slope, in lonely vales, and in the towns and settlements of the island, very large provision has been made for the religious wants of the people, while investigation establishes the fact, that in many districts the larger part of the population is in the habit of attending divine worship. In several localities surrounding the chapels, few persons were known to be altogether absentees from the house of God. Nothing could exceed the quietness, the order, and attention during divine service. The appearance of the people on the Lord's day in our chapels was generally neat; the instances of gaudy and tasteless dress were few, certainly not exceeding two per cent. of the whole attendance." They mention the following points as particularly worthy of notice:—"1. The prompt, vigorous, and searching discipline usually maintained throughout all the churches. 2. The tender interest and anxiety very frequently displayed towards those who have been excluded from the fellowship of the church. 3. With the character and devotedness of the deacons and leaders we were greatly pleased." They point out many defects, but these are mainly traceable to the fewness of ministers in the island. Two and three churches are placed under the pastoral superintendence of one man, and many evils result from this. Of our native pastors, they speak in very favorable terms.

The *Culabar Institution* was mainly designed for the training of a native pastorate. It is now associated with a Normal School, the pupils of which are members of churches, and a flourishing day-school is under the superintendence of the tutors and pupils of the Normal School. From the Theological Schools a number of efficient native pastors have gone forth, and are now laboring with great acceptableness.

Ministers and education are the great wants of the island, the report says; and in regard to them, aid to the amount of about \$5,000 a year would be demanded from the Baptist Society.

The sudden transition of such a population from slavery to freedom must of course involve inconveniences to many, and perhaps to all parties. The people of all classes find themselves in new relations to each other, involving new cares and responsibilities. The business of the country is revolutionized. The old way of managing large sugar estates is at an end, and the sugar business suffers for a time. But there is no blood shed; there are no disorders; the emancipated people accommodate themselves to their new condition peacefully, without suffering, and with as much intelligence and industry as could with any reason be expected. And the report quoted above shows that with a comparatively small amount of assistance from abroad, religious and educational institutions are likely to be sustained among them.—*Am. Missionary*.

There are two things that will make us happy in this life, if we attend to them. The first is, never to vex ourselves about what we cannot help; and the second, never to vex ourselves about what we can help.

The Principia.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1860.

LESSONS OF HISTORY.

"History"—it has been well said, "is philosophy teaching by example." A more exact and comprehensive expression of the thought would be, that history is Divine Providence, teaching the nature and tendencies of moral causes by their recorded effects. "God is in history." Man too, is in history, and he who would either "know God" or "study man" (as neither of them can be known or studied, effectually, without knowing and studying the other) must study history, and must do it with the thought uppermost in his mind, that he is taking lessons from the Omniscient Teacher himself, who knew the end from the beginning, and who arranged the great drama of human events, for the grand purposes of instruction.

Of all the shallow objections ever made to the divine inspiration of the Scriptures, one of the most shallow is that which exclaims, "A great part of the Bible is only history!" Only history? Just as though the historical parts of Scripture were mere lumber, that could be spared! Just as though there could be an adequate or credible divine revelation that should not embody large portions of history! For our own part, if we were about to write an argument in proof of the divine inspiration of the Scriptures, the historical portions of them should furnish one of the prominent stand-points of our observations—not so much for the mere purpose of showing the fulfilment of Scripture prophecy—a task which has been triumphantly accomplished already—as for the purpose of bringing out the lessons of super-human wisdom which are taught in that history, as taught by no other.

Alas! that the churches and the ministry have profited so little by those divine lessons that lie neglected in their Bibles, which they seem to venerate, but forget to study! Well would it have been for our now distracted country if Christian ministers had even tried to teach their flocks the uses of Bible history in directing their political activities and thus controlling the destiny of their nation.

But it is not enough to study Bible history. All authentic history, so far as it is a trust-worthy record of facts, is the history of divine Providence, teaching the nature and tendencies of moral causes, in the effects that have been produced by them. When studied by those who have first learned to study Bible history in the light of Bible theology and ethics, all history becomes impregnated with the *animus*, so to speak, of Bible history, and answers tolerably well, as a substitute for an inspired continuation of it, showing that the thing that now is, in substance, is the thing that has been, in the past ages, and that, in a sense, "there is no new thing under the sun."

Moral causes and effects are at work now in this country, and have been working, from the beginning of our nation's history, very much in the same way, and precisely in accordance with the same divine laws of retributive justice, as in the ancient nations whose history, intermingled and alternated with prophecy, is recorded in the Bible. To have studied and heeded those records would have been to have avoided the otherwise necessary recurrence of the same results that were before witnessed, and which must now needs be recorded likewise, for the admonition and instruction of the ages that are to come after us. If the terrible judgments inflicted on Egypt, upon Babylon, upon Assyria, upon Philistia, upon Edom, upon Israel, and upon Judah, cannot suffice to admonish and save our nation, then the history of our national overthrow, or terrible punishment, must be added to the ancient histories, for the more impressive warning of posterity who will stand nearer to us than to the ancients.

Europe, too, as well as America, is likely to furnish her lessons, either of deliverance, or of overthrow, accordingly as European Christendom shall have profited, or shall have failed to profit, by the study of God's Providential government of the Ancient Nations.

Many who are familiar with past history seem not to understand the history that is daily passing before them. One reason of this, perhaps, is that the history found in books

does not come quite down to their own times, leaving a chasm just there, where the past connects itself with the present. Modern newspaper journalism has, within the past century, and especially within the last few years, supplied this defect. Those who have carefully read and remembered the contents of good newspapers, for a few years past, and who still continue the thoughtful perusal of them, can have no good excuse for not discerning the signs of the times, anticipating coming events in the moral and political causes that are at work, elaborating them.

Who that has read Bible history, and the history of the last eighteen centuries, can wonder at the signs of civil commotion and disorganization that are even now beginning to upheave the civilized world, foreboding, if not presenting civil commotions in both hemispheres? Who, having read sacred and secular history, and the newspapers of the last thirty years can be at any loss for the moral causes of the agitations that are beginning to distract us, in this country?

Who that ever read the Scripture histories of Israel and Judah, with the prophetic commentaries of the Hebrew prophets, can fail to see the parallel between those times and the present?

Did not the great national sin of permitting the oppression of the poor, equally with the sin of idolatry, and by the side of it, form the burden of prophetic reproof and admonition? Did not the false prophets prophecy smooth things—prophecy falsely, and the priests and princes bear rule by their means, the people loving to have it so? Did they not cry "peace, peace," when there was no peace? Did they not daub with untempered mortar, healing the wounds of the nation slightly, contenting themselves with half reforms, making compromises with Beliel, and persecuting and deriding the true prophets who, in obedience to God, cried aloud, and spared not, lifting up their voice like a trumpet, showing the people of God their transgressions, and the house of Jacob their sins.

Could the old prophets rise again, would not their testimony and their rebukes be the same now that they were then? In what particular would the message need to be substantially changed? Are not the tolerated oppressions of this nation far heavier and more aggravated than were ever known in the land of Israel? Are not our idolatries of wealth as multiplied as were theirs, whether of Moloch or of Mammon. Does not the God who declares covetousness to be idolatry, discover as much idolatry, in the United States of America now, as he ever did in Israel or Judah? Are not our compromises with sin as odious and abominable in his sight, as were theirs?

How can ministers of religion, who profess to believe the Bible, and who nevertheless keep silence in respect to the great national sin of slaveholding, escape the same condemnation which God, by his holy prophets, pronounced upon false prophets of olden time?

SECESSION—COERSION.

To the Editor of the N. Y. Tribune.

DEAR SIR:—I see by the Tribune, that you are disposed to answer honest questions, even though they emanate from humble sources. I have to ask, and should be glad of an answer.

Are not the citizens of South Carolina, by a higher law than State law, citizens of the United States? Is not our national government to be used to regard and protect the rights of those citizens, any law of the State to the contrary notwithstanding? In the event then of secession, can the State deprive any of the inhabitants thereof, of their United States citizenship, whether they will or not?

If it cannot, how is the United States government to protect their rights? Cannot these citizens appeal to Congress, under Article IV, Section 4 of the Constitution for "a Republican form of government," subject to the higher authority of the Constitution? If it is said there may not be enough of those citizens to authorize a State government; still, would they not have the right to ask the establishment of a Territorial Government? Or, must they, unprotected in their rights, seek a national citizenship in some other State?

Let me come to this same point by another route:

Should the State Governments, all of them, or any number of them, as such, for any cause cease to exist or be operative, would the National Government as a consequence be destroyed, or the National Union be dissolved? In other words, can we the people of the several States as such, dissolve the bond of union which binds together "we the people of the United States?"

If not, and yet the people of the States, as such, are not disposed to exercise their reserved State rights, i. e., to continue in the exercise of State organism and legislation, shall they therefore no longer be citizens of the United States, no longer be entitled to claim the protection of the General Government? Would it not be right of Congress to give them, or establish over them, a Territorial Government? Now, can secession, so far as the Constitution of the United States or General Government is concerned, amount to anything more than a cessation of State existence or authority? If not, will not Congress, in case of the secession of South Carolina be in good faith bound, either to the guaranty of a Republican Government, or the establishment of a Territorial Government for her citizens? Very respectfully yours,

Montrose, Pa. Dec. 4, 1860.

A. L. Post.

Answer.

It is a far easier task to suggest difficulties than to solve them; but answering a few of Mr. Post's questions will dispose of the lot.

1. We will not undertake to decide whether citizens of any State are citizens also of the Union, by a law "higher" or lower than any State law. Our judgment would be that State and Federal laws are each paramount in their proper sphere respectively, and that neither is necessarily and in all cases above the other.

2. Mr. Post queries whether, if the State Governments should cease to exist, the Federal Government would therefore fall. We answer, decidedly, yes. If the State Governments were abolished, there could be no Constitutional election of U. S. Senators, and that would soon destroy the Government. Even though but half the State Governments were blotted out, this would soon deprive the Senate of a quorum, and thus render it impotent. And it would hardly be possible to maintain the Federal Government for a single year without a competent Senate.

3. As to what Congress may be bound, in a certain contingency, to do, we will not decide. It is far more to the purpose to decide what Congress can and will do. And we again avow our deliberate conviction that, whenever six or eight contiguous States shall have formally seceded from the Union, and avowed the pretty unanimous and earnest resolve of their people to stay out, it will not be found practicable to coerce them into subjection; and we doubt that any Congress can be found to direct and to provide for such coercion. One or two States may be coerced; not an entire section or quarter of the Union. If you do not believe this, wait and see.—[Ed. Trib.]

As the Tribune finds it inconvenient or inexpedient to meet, directly, some of the most important practical points involved in the questions of A. L. P., we propose to attempt answering them ourselves. In doing this, we may, perhaps answer some of the questions in a sense, or to an extent, not in the mind of the questioner, but, to our mind, necessarily involved in them.

1. We answer. All the citizens of South Carolina are citizens of the United States; under the Federal Constitution, which is "the supreme law of the land"—"anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."—Art. VI, clause 2, of the Constitution.

2. Our national government is to be used to regard and protect the rights of those citizens, any "law of the State to the contrary notwithstanding."

3. "In the event of secession"—such secession as is threatened by the slaveholders, a minority of the people, the inhabitants will not be deprived of their right of citizenship of the United States. To say otherwise would be to deny the rights of the people of South Carolina, under the Constitution of the United States.

4. "In the event of such secession" or without it, the people of South Carolina, or any portion of them, have a right to claim from Congress, under Article IV, section 4, of the Constitution, "a Republican form of government" subject to the higher authority of the Constitution.

5. "Should the State Governments" (or the administrators thereof,) or any number of them, either abdicate Government, or commit treason against the Federal Government, it would be the right and duty of the Federal Government to provide and guarantee to the law abiding people of the State "a Republican form of government" as aforesaid, or, if not sufficiently numerous, organize them into a Territory, as other Territories are organized.

But, the truth is that, properly speaking, there is no prospect or danger that either South Carolina, as a State, or any other slave State will secede from the Union. "The State of South Carolina" strictly speaking, is the people of South Carolina, not the petty oligarchy of slaveholders that, in defiance of the Constitution, now tyrannize over them. The moment the official dignitaries of South Carolina "secede" from under the United States Government, they disband, *de facto*, as a State Government, or usurp its powers. In violating their official oaths to support the Constitution of the United States, they declare the tie severed which binds them to the citizens of the United States, including that portion of the citizens of the United States, who are also citizens of South Carolina—they cut themselves adrift from them, and consequently from "the State of South Carolina," as well as from the United States.

There never has been, and there is not now, any "State of South Carolina" that has not been, and that is not, one of the "United States of America," as first declared in the Declaration of Independence, July 4, 1776. Before that Declaration, there was no "State of South Carolina," and the declaration makes her one of "the United States of Ameri-

When she repudiates the declaration of her unity with the other States, she repudiates her *Independence*, of course, and ceases to be a State.

South Carolina's "Declaration of Independence" was not only a declaration of her independence as one of the United States; but, it was also a declaration of the inalienable rights of all men, consequently of all the men in South Carolina, and an appeal to the "Supreme Judge of the World," for the rectitude of her intentions, "to establish a government 'for the security of those rights,' a government 'deriving its just powers from the consent of the governed'—declaring the right of 'THE PEOPLE' [the whole of them] 'to alter and abolish their government, and to institute a new government,'—'whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends.' So that, in seceding from the Union, South Carolina will disband her State government, and begin anew, with 'all men' as a constituency, to help organize.

Back of all this history, we find South Carolina represented in the old Continental Congress in 1774, participating in forming the "Articles of Association" of the United Colonies—not States—establishing strong powers of Congress over the Colonies, a Congress exercising the right to regulate commerce, pass Non-Importation Acts, and especially *interdicting the importation of slaves*. On behalf of South Carolina, these articles were signed by Henry Middleton, Thomas Lynch, Christopher Gadsen, John Rutledge, and Edward Rutledge—as many names, save one, as her present representation in Congress.

Every South Carolinian, black or white, bond or free, is a citizen of the United States, entitled to Federal protection, for the Federal Constitution, like the old Articles of Confederation of 1778, the Declaration of Independence, the Articles of Association, and the Gospel of the New Testament, knows nothing of race or complexion, and nothing of bond or free.

As to the bugbear of coercion, civil war, &c., all this is dispelled simply by remembering that the *slaveholders* are not South Carolina, that a majority of the people of South Carolina are colored, that a very large majority of the whites are non-slaveholders. A national proclamation of protection to these, as the Constitution requires, would settle the question with less difficulty or loss of blood, than it would cost to enforce a liquor prohibition bill in this city.

It is the North, not the South, that needs to be abolished.

THE DISCUSSIONS IN WILLIAMSBURG, on Civil Government, at the First Congregational Church, (Rev. S. S. Jocelyn's) are to be continued on Tuesday evenings, at ½ past 7 o'clock.

The second question, discussed last Tuesday evening was:

"What is Civil Government—and what are its objects?"

The third question, for next Tuesday evening, is:

"On whom do the responsibilities of Civil Government rest?"

Ladies and gentlemen attend these meetings—Admittance gratis—Seats free.

CORRECTIONS. In the Obituary, on the last column, last page, of our last week's paper, *Candora*, should have been *Cayastota*. Page 444—third column, 26th line from bottom—instead of "national oppression," read, "national suppression."

News of the Day.

A PICTURE OF HOME AT THE SOUTH.

A young lady in South Carolina thus writes to a relative in this city:

K—, S. C., Saturday, Dec. 1, 1860.

MY DEAR UNCLE: It is with different feelings that I set myself to pen these lines to you, from those which actuated me when I wrote you last. Then all looked bright and cheerful in the future—now how gloomy and portentous, still I fervently pray God that this cup may pass away from us. The country here is all aglow with the fires of revolution, and such is the intensity of excitement that we can scarcely find time or inclination to talk or think of anything other than the political topics of the day, and the moral and social consequences directly pertaining to secession. I fear that secession and revolution are, with our people, foregone conclusions, that we have gone so far, retraction and recession are impossible, and that civil war, with all its consequent horrors, is already upon us. I shudder for the wives and mothers, sisters and babes of South Carolina, as I contemplate the immediate future of the State. You need not

be surprised, at any time, to see me and the children in your midst, for no argument could induce me to remain here an hour longer than I should be compelled to, if the worst should come to the worst.

You may imagine, dear uncle, our situation, but you never can realize it in its fullness. Already we tremble in our own homes in anticipation and expectancy of what is liable to burst forth at any moment, a negro insurrection. Could you see the care and precaution displayed here by the proprietors of the negroes, not only planters but others, you would not for a moment envy us our possessions. Not a night passes that we do not securely lock our field servants in their quarters; but our most loved and valued house servants, who in ordinary times we would trust to any extent, are watched and guarded against with all the scrutiny and care that we possess. Our planters and owners of slave property do not allow their servants to have any intercourse with each other, and the negroes are confined strictly to the premises where they belong. We are all obliged to increase our force of overseers to prevent too free intercourse even among our own servants. The negroes feel and notice these new restraints, and naturally ask "Why is this?" But it is unnecessary for them to ask the question, for they all comprehend the cause as well as we who own them. They have already learned enough to give them an idea of what is going on in the State and nation, and this knowledge they have not gained from Abolitionists, as some suppose, but from the conversation of their owners indirectly held in their presence. They have already heard of Lincoln's election, and have heard also that he is for giving them their liberty, and you may imagine the result.

You have heard that our servants all love their masters, and their masters' families, and would lay down their lives for them—that the colored race in the South prefers Slavery to Freedom—that they would not be free if they could, &c. That is but the *poetry* of the case, the *reality* consists in sleeping upon our arms at night—in doubly bolting and barring our doors—in establishing and maintaining an efficient patrol force—buying watch dogs, and taking turns in watching our sleeping children, to guard them and ourselves from the vengeance of these same "loving servants"—a vengeance which, though now smoldering, is liable to burst out at any moment, to overwhelm the State in spite of the Palmetto flags or State precautions.

You at the North are not the only ones who are suffering financially by this new panic. The planters among us are really suffering from the depreciation in their property. Already negroes are not worth half price. No one dares buy a servant, fearing lest he in doing so, should be introducing upon his plantation one tainted with the idea of freedom.

My husband has but a few servants—I believe but thirty-one all told—still I feel (and so does he) that they are thirty-one too many in such times as these. He would sell them immediately, if it were possible, but the truth is, he could realize nothing for them at present, or at most not over half their real value. Slaves are a drug in the market, my husband says, and you know him well enough to judge of his judgment in such matters.

Now, one word as to the military force of the State, to protect us against an insurrection. I presume, with the exception of Charleston, and perhaps a few larger towns, that the remainder of the State is situated very much as we are here; and I will give you an idea of how well prepared we are to resist a mob. Upon our place of about 1,200 acres we have: of whites, males—husband, two overseers, and my son of 18 years; total four; females—self and cousin, little Lucy and one of the overseer's has a wife—four; of whom only four at the most are capable of bearing arms—to effect which we have at least seventeen field hands—sturdy young negroes—beside the female servants. And this is a fair representation of the force upon our plantations. Considering such a state of facts do you blame me for desiring to absent myself my husband, and children, from the State?

THE QUESTION OF SECESSION—OFFICIAL VIEW OF THE CASE—OPINION OF ATTORNEY GENERAL BLACK.

We have not room for the entire Letter, but present some of the prominent points, in the following extracts. The Letter is addressed to "The President of the United States," and commences thus:—

ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S OFFICE,
November 20, 1860.

Sir: I have the honor to receive your note of the 17th, and I now reply to the grave questions therein propounded, as fully as the time allowed me will permit.

Within their respective spheres of action the federal government and the government of a state are both of them independent and supreme, but each is utterly powerless beyond the limits assigned to it by the constitution. If Congress would attempt to change the law of descents, to make a new rule of personal succession, or to dissolve the family relations existing in any state, the act would be simply void; but not more void than would be a state law to prevent the recapture of fugitives from labor, to forbid the carrying of the mails, or to stop the collection of duties on imports. The will of a state, whether expressed in its constitution or laws, cannot, while it remains in the confederacy, absolve her people from the duty of obeying the just and constitutional requirements of the central government. Nor can any act of the central government displace

the jurisdiction of a state, because the laws of the U. S. are supreme and binding only so far as they are passed in pursuance of the constitution. I do not say what might be effected by mere revolutionary force. I am speaking of legal and constitutional rights.

After citing authorities in support of his opinion, Mr. Black proceeds:—

To the Chief Executive Magistrate of the Union is confided the solemn duty of seeing the laws faithfully executed. That he may be able to meet this duty with a power equal to its performance, he nominates his own subordinates and removes them at his pleasure. For the same reason the land and naval forces are under his orders as their commander-in-chief. But his power is to be used only in the manner prescribed by the legislative department. He cannot accomplish a legal purpose by illegal means, or break the laws himself to prevent them from being violated by others.

The law requires that all goods imported into the United States within certain collection districts shall be entered at the proper port, and the duty thereon shall be received by the collector appointed for, and residing at that port. But the functions of the collector may be exercised anywhere at or within the port. There is no law which confines him to the custom house, or to any other particular spot. If the custom-house were burnt down, he might remove to another building; if he were driven from the shore he might go on board a vessel in the harbor. If he keeps within the port he is within the law.

A port is a place to which merchandise is imported, and from whence it is exported. It is created by law. It is not merely a harbor or haven, for it may be established where there is nothing but an open roadstead, or on the shore of a navigable river, or at any other place where vessels may arrive and discharge or take in their cargoes. It comprehends the city or town which is occupied by the mariners, merchants, and others who are engaged in the business of importing and exporting goods, navigating the ships and furnishing them with provisions. It includes also so much of the water adjacent to the city as is usually occupied by vessels discharging or receiving their cargoes or lying at anchor and waiting for that purpose.

Mr. Black relates how the Act of March 1833 authorized the President, "in a certain contingency to direct that the customs be collected at any secure place within some port or harbor of such district" &c. But that Act has expired. The President, however, he says, has the power to collect the duties within the harbor of any port of entry, whether in a vessel or on shore—the harbor of Charleston for example. The Letter proceeds:

Your right to take such measures as may seem to be necessary for the protection of the public property, is very clear. It results from the proprietary rights of the government as owner of the forts, arsenals, magazines, dock-yards, navy-yards, custom-houses, public ships and other property which the United States have bought, built and paid for. Besides, the government of the United States is authorized by the constitution (art. 1. sec. 8,) to "exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over all places purchased by the consent of the legislature of the state in which the same shall be for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dock-yards, and other needful buildings." It is believed that no important public building has been bought or erected on ground where the legislature of the state in which it is has not passed a law consenting to the purchase of it and ceding the exclusive jurisdiction. This government, then, is not only the owner of those buildings and grounds, but, by virtue of the supreme and paramount law, it regulates the action and punishes the offences of all who are within them. If any one of an owner's rights is plainer than another it is that of keeping exclusive possession and repelling intrusion. The right of defending the public property includes also the right of recapture after it has been unlawfully taken by another. President Jefferson held the opinion and acted upon it, that he could order a military force to take possession of any land to which the United States had title, though they had never occupied it before, though a private party claimed and held it, and though it was not then needed nor proposed to be used for any purpose connected with the operations of the government. This may have been a stretch of Executive power; but the right of retaking public property, in which the government has been carrying on its lawful business, and from which its officers have been unlawfully thrust out, cannot well be doubted; and when it was exercised at Harper's Ferry in October, 1859, every one acknowledged the legal justice of it.

I come now to the point in your letter which is probably of the greatest practical importance: By the act of 1807 you may employ such parts of the land and naval forces as you shall judge necessary for the purpose of causing the laws to be duly executed, in all cases where it is lawful to use the militia for the same purpose. By the act of 1795 the militia may be called forth "whenever the laws of the United States shall be opposed or the execution thereof obstructed in any state by combinations too powerful to be suppressed by the ordinary course of judicial proceedings, or by the power vested in the marshals." This imposes

upon the President the sole responsibility of deciding whether an exigency has arisen which requires the use of military force; and in proportion to the magnitude of that responsibility will be his care not to over step the limits of his legal and just authority.

The laws referred to in the act of 1795, are manifestly those which are administered by the judges, and executed by the ministerial officers of the courts for the punishment of crimes against the United States—for the protection of rights claimed under the federal constitution and laws, and for the enforcement of such obligations as come within the cognizance of the federal judiciary. To compel obedience to these laws, the courts have authority to punish all who obstruct their administration, and the marshals and their deputies have the same powers as sheriffs and their deputies in the several states in executing the laws of the states. These are the ordinary means provided for the execution of the laws, and the whole spirit of our system is opposed to the employment of any other, except in cases of extreme necessity, arising out of great and unusual combinations against them. Their agency must continue to be used until their incapacity to cope with the power opposed to them shall be plainly demonstrated. It is only upon clear evidence to that effect, that a military force can be called into the field. Even then, its operations must be purely defensive. It can suppress only such combinations as are found directly opposing the laws and obstructing the execution thereof. It can do no more than what might and ought to be done by a civil posse, if a civil posse could be raised, large enough to meet the same opposition. On such occasions especially, the military power must be kept in strict subordination to the civil authority, since it is only in aid of the latter that the former can act at all.

But what if the feeling in any State against the United States, should become so universal, that the Federal officers themselves, (including judges, district attorneys, and marshals), would be reached by the same influences, and resign their places? Of course, the first step would be to appoint others in their stead, if others could be got to serve. But, in such an event, it is more than probable that great difficulty would be found in filling the offices. We can easily conceive how it might become altogether impossible. We are therefore obliged to consider what can be done in case we have no courts to issue judiciary process, and no ministerial officers to execute it. In that event troops would certainly be out of place, and their use wholly illegal. If they are sent to aid the courts and marshals, there must be courts and marshals to be aided. Without the exercise of those functions, which belong exclusively to the civil service, the laws cannot be executed in any event, no matter what may be the physical strength which the government has at its command. Under such circumstances, to send a military force into any State with orders to act against the people, would be simply making war upon them.

The existing laws put and keep the federal government strictly on the defensive. You can use force only to repel an assault on the public property, and aid the courts in the performances of their duty. If the means given you to collect the revenue and execute the other laws, be insufficient for that purpose, Congress may extend and make them more effectual toward that end.

If one of the States should declare her independence, your action cannot depend upon the rightfulness of the cause upon which such declaration is based. Whether the retirement of a State from the Union, be the exercise of a right reserved in the constitution, or a revolutionary movement, it is certain that you have not in either case the authority to recognize her independence, or to absolve her from her federal obligations. Congress, or the other States in Convention assembled, must take such measures as may be necessary and proper. In such an event, I see no course for you but to go straight onward in the path you have hitherto trodden—that is, execute the laws to the extent of the defensive means placed in your hands and act generally upon the assumption that the present constitutional relations between the states and the federal government, continue to exist, until a new order of things shall be established, either by law or force.

Mr. Black proceeds to discuss the question "whether Congress has a right to make war upon one or more states, and require the Executive to carry it on, by means of force to be drawn from the other states." He comes to the conclusion that Congress has no such power.

[How well this agrees with the former parts of his Letter is a question deserving of consideration.]

The letter closes as follows:

If this view of the subject be correct, as I think it is, then the Union must utterly perish, at the moment when Congress shall arm one part of the people against another, for any purpose beyond that of merely protecting the general government in the exercise of its proper constitutional functions. I am, very respectfully yours, &c., J. S. BLACK.

To the President of the United States.

The N. Y. Evening Post, in reviewing the above letter says:

The legal adviser of the Administration has published his opinion on the constitutional relations of the separate states and the central government. Its substance was foreshadowed by the feeble expositions of the President. Mr. Black, like

Mr. Buchanan, condemns the theory of secession, but he has nothing effective to oppose to it in practice. He admits that the federal Executive is bound to enforce the laws of the United States, but the extent of that obligation he measures by the number of persons engaged in their resistance. If a whole State chooses to secede, he represents the government to be virtually impotent. To send troops to quell any disturbance, or to aid the federal officers in the discharge of their duties, would be to make war upon a State, and to make war upon a State, would be to abrogate the federal constitution.

The error of Mr. Black consists in supposing that the enforcement of the laws against offending individuals, would be equivalent to a declaration of war against a State. But the laws, and the executive of the laws, know nothing of States. The former act alone upon persons, and the latter put them into effect only against persons. The State, as a State, has nothing to do with the question, and it intervenes, whenever it does intervene, of its own motion and at its own peril. A citizen of South Carolina refusing to pay duties, is derelict under the laws of the United States, and by that law he must be tried and punished. Should he persuade a thousand or ten thousand of his followers into the same attitude of resistance, he does not thereby discharge himself of his obligations as a citizen of the United States, but he simply foments rebellion.

Coercion is an odious term; the coercion of a state an offensive and objectionable one; but to execute the just and constitutional laws against refractory citizens, is not coercion in this sense. President Washington, when, in the whisky war of Pennsylvania, in which several counties were joined in resistance to the imposition of excise duties, he called for the militia of other states to assist the governmental agents, did not suppose he was coercing Pennsylvania. He merely enabled the regular authorities of the general government to do the duties imposed upon them by the law, and by their oaths.

A resort of this extreme kind, however, is not needed in the treatment of South Carolina. Mr. Black has shown an equally effective and far more peaceable method.

The Post here recites from Mr. Black's letter, the paragraph affirming the right of the President to collect the duties from on board a public vessel, in the harbor, and then says further:

A national vessel stationed at Fort Moultrie, to see the customs properly collected, would be all that is necessary. Should the South Carolina authorities attempt to interfere with her, they would be making war upon the United States, not the United States making war upon them.

The Post next remarks that Congress, which made Charleston a port of entry, might suspend or repeal that portion of the act which made her one.

No vessel could sail from there, because no such vessel would have a manifest and a clearance which other nations would recognize. No vessel from abroad would enter there, because there would be no means of perfecting an entry, and neither owner nor captain would take upon himself the hazards of a probable confiscation. South Carolina is not herself known as a sovereign nation by any of the mercantile powers, nor could she get herself recognized for a long time to come, particularly without the consent of the United States. A manifest issued by her, would have no more effect, in the tribunal of the world, than a manifest signed there by a few persons in Chatham street. It would be no protection to cargo or crew, the one of which would be contraband, and the other piratical.

Here, then, we have a peaceful antidote for that "peaceful remedy" which is called secession. It is no act of war, nor hostility, to revoke the permission given to any town to be a port of entry; but when that permission is revoked, it would be an act of hostility either on the part of our own citizens, or of foreigners, to disregard the injunction.

Between Mr. Black, and the Evening Post, the President and the President elect might find a quiet way of managing South Carolina.—EDITOR.

JOHN M. BUTTS ON SECESSION.

Now that the subject of secession is under discussion, it is well to notice and record the various views of prominent men, Northern and Southern, on the subject. The letter of Mr. Butts is among the most remarkable of these.

On one point we must strongly protest against his course of argument. If he thinks to stave off secession by procuring a repeal of Northern Personal Liberty bills, or by other concessions to slavery, he is doomed, we trust, to ultimate disappointment, whatever the course of politicians may be.

LETTER FROM HON. JOHN M. BUTTS.

RICHMOND, Nov. 27, 1860.

MY DEAR SIR:—I have been endeavoring to make an opportunity for some days past, to answer your very friendly and seductive letter, but my whole time, day and night, has been so constantly occupied with matters that cannot be postponed, that until the present, I have been compelled to defer it—and even now I must be brief.

I speak of your letter as being seductive; I refer, of course, to those portions which hold out promises of future greatness, if I will "else upon the present occasion with a nervous grasp, and guide the movement in favor of secession" which you

think is fixed and inevitable; and many a charming woman has sacrificed her honor and her reputation to the insidious tempter, and under far less imposing circumstances than those you present for my consideration; but it was only because they had not the firmness to say, as I do now say to you, in the language of our Saviour—"Get thee behind me, Satan."

I did not concur with you in the opinion that the dissolution of the Union is inevitable; the sky looks threatening, I grant you, but so it has done before, and yet the clearest sunshine has succeeded, without a shower of rain or peal of thunder—so I trust it will be again. But if it should be otherwise, and the government of the United States is to be overthrown, no part of the folly, the wickedness, or the crime, shall be charged upon me, either by the wise and good men of the present age, or of generations yet to come.

True, South Carolina has rushed on, with a head-long impetuosity, wholly unsuited to the gravity of the occasion, as if she were afraid to trust herself with time for calm deliberation, relying more upon the passion than the wisdom of her people; and it may be that, under a ridiculous and false idea of a coming pride, and true greatness, she may involve herself in very serious difficulty; she may even declare herself out of the Union; she did so by ordinance in convention in 1863, but still the Union was not rent asunder, nor will it now be, as I think; no other State is likely to go with her, and what is best, and surest of all, Virginia certainly will not, in her present state of mind.

If I could see the least semblance of justification in the attitude South Carolina has assumed, I would sympathize with her—but I cannot for reasons already given in my speech, which you say you have just read. I see nothing in that position but plain, bold, flat-footed rebellion against, and treason to the rest of the States, and I cannot under any contingency, be induced to take sides with her in her disloyalty and treachery. Who can ask it of me, when her own most trusted and active leader, Mr. Yancey, in his Montgomery speech, said:

"If I understand my distinguished friend from Virginia (Mr. Pryor), the election of a Black Republican President would be an issue for disunion. I understand my learned colleague (Mr. Hilliard), to say, that upon that issue he would be ready to dissolve the Union. I say with all deference to my colleagues here, that no more unfair issue could be tendered to the South upon which we should dissolve the Union, than the loss of an election. When I am asked to raise the flag of revolution against an election under the forms of the law and the Constitution, I am asked to do an unconstitutional thing, according to the Constitution, as it now exists. I am asked to put myself in the position of a rebel, of a traitor, in a position where, if the Government should succeed, and put down the revolution, I and my friends could be arraigned before the Supreme Court of the United States, and there be sentenced to be hanged for violating the Constitution and laws of the country."

Such is the admission of the leader whom you propose to follow and you made an earnest appeal to me to unite with you in assuming the position of a rebel and a traitor, for which I may be sentenced to be hanged for violating the Constitution and laws of my country. Pardon me, my respected, but impetuous friend, but I had rather not; I am impelled by every consideration of honor and duty to decline your very polite invitation.

Do you doubt, or does any sensible and reflecting man doubt, that Mr. Yancey described truly the situation which every man occupies who favors the movement of South Carolina, because of the election of Mr. Lincoln? For even she does not pretend, that she would have occupied her present position if Lincoln had been defeated, and yet, are you not surprised to see so many of our own people turning rebels and traitors at her bidding?—are you not indeed surprised yourself? Rebel and traitor! very imposing and high sounding designations in the estimation of some, perhaps, but I have no particular desire that they should attach to my name—either now, or in after life. My aspirations do not run in that line.

South Carolina, spurning the counsels and co-operation of Virginia, and other Southern States, has, of her own accord, and upon her own hook, chosen to raise a mighty and a fearful issue with the general government and upon the general government rests the responsibility of settling the question. Hands off, and fair play to both, say I. In its present stage we have nothing to do with it: and so far as I am concerned, I turn her over to "Uncle Sam," and if she can maintain her position against that respectable and powerful old gentleman, let her have all the honor and glory, and benefit of the achievement herself. I hope she may have a good and a merry time of it. She will be a State of the Union in a state of rebellion, and I have not a shadow of doubt, either of the right, or the power to control her; the only question would be—Is it worth while? Would it not be better to let her go out, and stay out, until she had made the experiment, and, like the prodigal son, return to her home to eat up the fattest calf.

But that unfortunately would lead to another perplexing difficulty, which is, that it would amount to an acknowledgment, that we have no government, and never had one, that our fathers were a set of old fools and fogies, who thought they were making for their posterity a government that would endure forever, while it was nothing more than a voluntary association of States, to be tolerated only so long as it was entirely convenient and agreeable to all the parties to remain in it, but that the moment it became irksome to any one State, it might be broken up, as readily as an ordinary party at whist, whenever one of the parties happen to tire or grow drowsy—and it requires but little reflection to satisfy any reasoning man, that if the doctrine of the right of secession is once recognized by the government, all its powers cease at once even although the doctrine be not carried into practical effect. The government is now supported by loans and treasury notes, and has been with the exception of short intervals for the last twenty-five years. What credit would the government be entitled to, and what could it obtain, either at home or abroad, if it were understood that any one State might at any moment break up the government, and thus cancel the debt, as South Carolina now proposes to cancel hers?

When should we be safe in declaring war in defence of our honor, or our rights, or for the protection of our people, if, in the midst of the war, the Union could be dissolved, and the government destroyed, whenever some one of the States might be disappointed in the election of her favorite candidate for the Presidency, or because her interest would be promoted by doing so, or because it would enhance the price of cotton to open a direct trade with the enemy? What government on earth would thereafter treat with us, as one of the nations of the world, or treat us with respect? I do not wish to be disrespectful to anybody, and most surely not to you, but I hope you will pardon me for saying that one of the inconceivable and irreconcilable things of this world, to my mind, is that an idea, of such unmitigated and unmitigated nonsense and absurdity as that of the right of a State to secede at pleasure, should ever have obtained a place in the mind of any man who was not an absolute fanatic. Men's minds are differently organized, I know, and we see things through different optics, and I dare say you and others look upon me in the same light as I look upon you and upon them. Well be it so; honors are easy, and we break even.

It has become quite a favorite and fashionable mode of expression to say; "this is not a government of force: the government was not made by force, and cannot be kept together by force."

It is very true that the government was not made by force, and it is for that very reason that there is no right to break it up, and that it can be kept together by force; whether that is a desirable mode of doing it is altogether a different question; if it had been formed by force, if some tyrannical despot had formed a government upon the people which had never obtained their approval or assent, then any of the parties would be justified in throwing it off whenever they could get rid of it; but it is precisely because it was not made by force, but that, on the other hand, it was a free and voluntary compact, entered into one with another, and each one with all the rest, that there is a power to enforce the compact.

Debits are not and cannot be created by force, but if voluntarily entered into, the payment of the obligation may be enforced by the strong arm of the law; and the compact between the States having been voluntarily entered into, may in like manner be enforced, if necessary, by the strong arm of the government, and it is so government at all, if it is not one of sufficient force to protect itself against treason and rebellion on the part of its own citizens.

If it is not a government of force, why was Congress clothed with the power "to provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrection, and repel invasions," whether they come from within or without? Pshaw; that's all fallacy, to tickle the ears of groundlings. It was a government of force, and very efficient force in 1833, when the force bill passed a democratic Congress, in the House by a vote of 149 to 48, and in the Senate by 23 to 1. When and how has the Constitution been changed since that time? or is it only because statesmen have grown more wise, of late? Establish this doctrine of secession, and it is at once settled that there is an absolute impossibility of ever forming a fixed, permanent, and stable government out of two or more States; for if our Constitution does not make this a permanent government as designed by the founders, then language cannot be employed that would make it so, and our institutions are no better than those of Mexico.

But if a new confederacy were to be formed, I could not go with you, for I should use whatever influence I might be able to exert, against entering into one with South Carolina, that has played the part of a common brawler and disturber of the public peace for the last thirty years, and who could give no security that I would be willing to accept, that she would not be as faithless to the next compact as she has been to this which she is now endeavoring to avoid. In addition to which, the objects and interests of South Carolina as she conceives them, are essentially at variance with those of Virginia, this state will never sanction piracy, and if not, South Carolina does not desire our company, and would get rid of us, as soon as possible.

What may be the ultimate condition of things, I do not pretend to be prophetic enough to foretell, but I do not think there is any likelihood that any other state will go out, as South Carolina proposes to do, in a sort of sky-rocket blaze; the rest will be disposed to consider matters more carefully, and will take time for consideration and reflection, during which much may, and I think will be done, to reconcile existing differences.

The northern party has succeeded to power; they are, therefore, deeply interested, in a political sense, in keeping the Union together, and can well afford to do all that we have a right to demand, under the Constitution; and if they do not, we may be able to accomplish all that is essential, through the action of Congress.

Now, as you say to me, "sit down side by side with me," and let us talk this matter over. Suppose the North should agree to repeal all their obnoxious legislation, which has for its object the obstruction to the execution of the fugitive slave law (which they ought not to hesitate to do, even if no Union were at stake), and if not, suppose Congress should so modify that law as to relieve it of that obnoxious feature to which I referred in my Lynchburg speech, and thereby add to, rather than impair its efficiency, and accompanying that legislation with a bill declaring it to be a felony of the highest grade, and subject to heavy penalties by fine and imprisonment to rescue or attempt to rescue a slave in custody of the officers, or after he had been restored to his master, and making the general government responsible for the value of the slave that may be rescued, and holding it as a charge against the state that shall permit the law to be thus violated within its territory; then suppose, in reference to the territories, there should be wisdom and patriotism enough, in both sections of the country, to restore matters to the condition they occupied prior to 1854, by re-establishing the Missouri Compromise line, don't you think, my good friend, you could then be persuaded to agree that all the Southern States, except South Carolina would agree even without the restoration of the Missouri line, to remain a little longer in the Union? although South Carolina might have assumed that she was too good, and high toned, and chivalric to remain where Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, Maryland, North Carolina and Missouri would be proud to stay? And if South Carolina should be deaf to all remonstrance, and insist that she would stay out after that, don't you think she ought to be left to share the fate she had so unnecessarily courted and provoked?

All this I have strong hope may be accomplished, if reasonable time is allowed—a suitable spirit is adopted, and a proper course is pursued; but I do not think it can be done by the system of bullying and bravado, that many of our leading men seem to have a decided passion for. The North and South are equally brave, and a brave people, like a brave man, will always despise and defy a bully, and there has been too much of that game, played on both sides.

I believe in the patriotism of reflecting men of all parties and of both sections, and I am confident in the belief that each will, in the spirit, that animated our fathers, for the sake of the Union, surrender much that has been claimed on both sides, before they pull down this great temple of liberty on their own heads.

I will not stop to inquire which sections would suffer most from a rupture of the Union, because I do not calculate its value by dollars and cents; it is enough for me to know, that both would sustain a calamity that neither time nor labor nor money could repair. But to accomplish anything, reason and persuasion must take the place of threats and taunts and crimination, and recrimination. How all this is to be brought about, is another question, which I leave to those who are in power to bring it about—but I have an abiding trust and confidence in the same Good Spirit that has directed us through every trying difficulty that the way will be prepared to save the great, glorious, thrice-blessed, and God-like work of our fathers to us, and to our children's children.

One thing, my friend, you may be assured of, that when the necessity shall arise for Virginia to take up arms against the government of the United States, she will require no other state to set her an example of what it became her honor to do, but she will neither be "hitched on" nor "dragged into" any rebellious or treasonable movement by the most spoiled child of the whole family. Virginia made the Union; it is chiefly the work of the hands of her children, and she will adhere to, abide in, protect and preserve it, until some stronger reason than now exists for its destruction.

One word more. Are we to have a state convention? I hope not, there is no sufficient reason for a convention; the public mind is not in a condition for a convention; it is in too excited a state for such deliberation as the public interests demand; and artful means have been used to make it so, and the state of your own mind serves as evidence of the fact.

Men are not made wiser or more temperate from being sent into a convention, than to any other deliberative body, such as Congress or the legislature; nor have we any reason to suppose, when party spirit runs as high as it does now, that wiser and better men would be selected for such a place and for such a purpose as is contemplated; and would you ordinarily trust, or do you know anybody who would be willing to trust the existence or destruction of this national government to the hands of those who fill either of these departments? The world was not made in an hour; it is not likely to be destroyed in a day. There is no occasion, then, for such remarkable haste.

Nobody proposes to fire our dwellings or steal our substance away from us. There is plenty of time before us. Let us then be patient, be wise, be moderate—give time for the passions excited by the late election and the scenes that now surround us to calm down. Let us act like men, and not like children, and above all, let us take time to ascertain facts, and not be led away from the path of duty and honor by the ten thousand misrepresentations that are scattered broadcast over the country for the purpose of inflaming popular passion.

It takes a great while to build up a government, and it will require a vast deal of labor, reflection, foresight, knowledge, wisdom, and experience to form one that will prove a satisfactory substitute for this which you propose to discard.

Do you feel sure that the state is prepared at a moment's notice to bring all these various and essential elements to bear upon this subject? If you are, I am not! and as there is less danger to be apprehended from cautious deliberation, than from impetuous haste, I beg you to unite with me in urging the people of Virginia not to be in too great a hurry to destroy, or hazard the loss of, what all the world will never be able to give them again.

I am respectfully, your obedient servant and friend.

J. M. BOTTS.

To H. B. M., esq., of Staunton, Va

CONGRESS.

From the Times of Tuesday.

The session of Congress, yesterday, was attended with far less excitement than we were led to anticipate, from the tenor of our dispatches of Sunday night. The discussions upon all topics connected with the subject of secession, were conducted with calmness, and altogether a decidedly better feeling was exhibited on every side. In the Senate, the Standing Committee of the last session were continued; Mr. Latham's resolution relative to the overland mail was referred to the committee on Post offices and Post roads; a memorial from Thaddeus Hyatt, presented by Mr. Sumner, relative to the suffering people of Kansas, was referred to the Committee on Territories; and the Homestead bill was read for the first time. Mr. Powell, of Kentucky, then called up his resolution, presented on Thursday, relative to the present condition of the country, and made a few remarks expressive of his views. Mr. Collamer, of Vermont, made a motion, which was agreed to by Mr. Powell, to strike out everything from the resolution excepting that which referred to federal affairs, and that it be referred to a Special Committee. During a discussion which intervened, Mr. Latham of California, said that his State would remain with the Union under all circumstances—intimating that she could otherwise never secure that great desideratum, a Pacific Railroad. Mr. Foster, of Connecticut, said the management of the country for the present was with the Democrats, but he should support the resolution. Mr. Douglas hoped that there would be no more talk of party until this grave question was settled. Mr. Davis, of Mississippi, did not regard the proposition as one promising a good result. Several other speeches were made on the subject, among which was one by Mr. Dixon, of Connecticut, who combated the idea that it is impossible for the two systems of free and slave labor to exist in the confederacy, and the Senate adjourned at a late hour. In the House, Mr. Hawkins, of Florida, proceeded to give additional reasons for asking to be excused from serving on the Special Committee on the Perilous Con-

dition of the Union. He concluded by a warning that Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, Georgia and South Carolina were certain to secede, to be followed by Arkansas, Louisiana and Texas. The tone of his remarks, however, was rather more moderate than was expected. Mr. Vallandigham of Ohio, in a rather ill-conceived speech, argued in favor of excusing Mr. Hawkins. Mr. McClernard, of Illinois, was unwilling to excuse him. Mr. Sickles, of New York, believed that the power to deal with the pending political question rests with the Republican Party, and he desired that the Legislatures of the Northern States might be convened, in order that they might deal with it. The vote, on Mr. Hawkins' request, was not taken,—the discussion being interrupted by the introduction, from the Committee of Ways and Means, of a bill authorizing the issue of ten millions in Treasury notes, for the relief of the Government. The bill was passed after a brief debate, and the House adjourned.

From the same of Wednesday.

The debate on the question of secession, commenced in Congress on Monday, was continued yesterday in both Houses, and occupied the attention of the Senate until late in the afternoon. Although the discussion was animated, the temper of Senators was good—the most violent demonstration being from Mr. Iverson, of Georgia, the tone of whose remarks was generally deprecated. Before the debate commenced, the House Treasury Note and Loan bill, was referred to the Committee on Finance; and subsequently, on motion of Mr. Hale, the Committee on Military Affairs was instructed to inquire whether the expenses of the army cannot be reduced without detriment. The resolution of Mr. Powell, of Kentucky, was then taken up, and Mr. Bigler of Pennsylvania, proceeded to give his views in reference to secession. He announced himself a thorough Union man, and declared himself ready, like Mr. Douglas, to go with men of every party who will devote themselves to the work of rescuing the country from impending danger. Mr. Iverson declared that the South did not fear the operation of the Personal Liberty bills, nor care for the operation of the Fugitive Slave law. If she were left to herself, the slave population would increase in thirty years from four and a half to thirty millions; and if, on the contrary, the North prevailed, universal emancipation would eventually take place. The debate was participated in by Messrs. Pugh, of Ohio, Ten Eyck, of New Jersey, Green, of Missouri, Douglas, of Illinois, Fitch, of Indiana, Powell, of Kentucky, Wade, of Ohio, Davis, of Mississippi, Mason, of Virginia, Collamer, of Vermont, Brown, of Mississippi, Iverson, of Georgia, and Wigfall, of Texas,—the prominent point being the violations of the Fugitive Slave law. Mr. Douglas combated the idea that because the rights of the Southern States had been violated, they were justified in breaking up the Union. In the House, business was confined principally to the consideration of the construction of the Select Committee on the perilous condition of the Union, and the results to be effected by it. Mr. Cobb, of Alabama, announced himself as a Union man, and desired that the Committee should commence its labors as soon as possible, as immediate action became necessary, in view of the fact that the Convention called in his State, would meet on the 7th of January. Mr. Davis, of Mississippi, declared his intention to serve on the Committee. He had entertained an opinion that the Southern members should withdraw, and leave the Republicans to submit a report, but his views had undergone a modification. The House, 101 to 93, then refused to excuse Mr. Hawkins, of Florida; when that gentleman refused positively to serve. Mr. Boyce, of South Carolina, then asked to be excused, and objection being made by Mr. Smith, of Virginia, another long debate ensued. Mr. Smith expressed surprise that the Republicans had thus far declined to participate in the discussions. It was intimated in rejoinder, that the Republicans did not refuse to discuss the questions in issue, but they considered that the proper time for discussion would be after the Committee had made a report. The House did not take a vote on the question of excusing Mr. Boyce. Mr. Sherman reported, from the Committee of Ways and Means, the Diplomatic and Consular Appropriation bill, and one for the support of the Indian Department. The petition of Thaddeus Hyatt, relative to the sufferers in Kansas, was also introduced, and referred to the Committee on Territories. To day the States will be called in regular order for bills and resolutions, and those relative to the condition of the Union, will go to the Select Committee.

The Wesleyan Methodist Church of the Pilgrims, have commenced Religious Services in 34th St. cor. of 8th Avenue, in a beautiful Hall, neatly fitted up for the purpose, and convenient, situated South side of the street, and West of the Avenue, Rev. E. A. S. A. Pastor. There will be preaching every Sabbath, at 10 A.M. and 7 P.M. Other Religious services will be held, through the week. The Reforms of the day will be advocated. All Anti-Slavery and Temperance people, in a word, all Christians, are invited to come in, and help build up a pure church, and spread a pure Gospel.

Family Miscellany.

SABBATH IN THE COUNTRY.

The creaking wagon's in the shed.
The busy flail is heard no more;
The horse is littered down and fed,
The harness hangs above his head,
The whip behind the door.

His leathern gloves and crooked bill
To-day the woodman throws aside;
The blacksmith's fiery forge is still,
The wooden wheel of the old mill
Sleeps in the mill-dam wide.

The miller's boat is anchored where,
Far out, the lilies sleep;
You see their shadow mirrored there,
The broad white flowers reflected clear
Within the mill-pond deep.

The harrow's in the garden shed,
Hoe, rake, and spade are put away;
Unweeded stands the onion bed,
The gard'ner from his work hath fled,
'Tis holy Sabbath day.

Upon the wall the white cat sleeps,
By which the churn and milk-pan lie;
A drowsy watch the house dog keeps,
And scarcely from his dull eye peeps,
Upon the passer by.

And sweetly over hill and dale
The silvery sounding church bells ring;
Across the moor, and down the dale,
They come and go, and on the gale
Their Sabbath tiding fling.

From where the white-washed Sunday school
Peeps out between the poplars dim—
Which ever throw their shadows cool
Far out upon the dusty pool—
You hear the Sabbath hymn.

From farm and field, and grange grown gray,
From woodland walks and winding ways,
The old and young, the grave and gay,
Unto the old church come to pray,
And sing God's holy praise.

[From Life Illustrated.]

YIELD NOT TO DARK DESPAIR.

Hast thou one heart that loves thee,
In this dark world of care,
Whose gentle smile approves thee?
Yield not to dark despair.

One hand whose loving fingers
Are pressed in thine alone;
One fond, confiding bosom,
Whose thoughts are all thine own?

One truthful voice to guide thee,
And bless thee in distress;
One breast when thou art weary,
Whereon thy head to rest?

Till death thy form have shrouded,
And cold that heart so warm;
Till death the earth have clouded,
Heed not the passing storm;

Thou hast one tie to bind thee,
And little life-buds rare—
Let love, sweet love entwine thee,
In this dark world of care.

COLUMBUS, WIS.

DARK SYBIL.

MODERN MARTYRDOM.

BY MRS. GEORGE WASHINGTON WYLLYS.

The ancient worthies that we read about were in the habit of making a very great parade on the subject of their sacrifices to friendship. Damon and Pythias, Antonio and Bassanio, and half a dozen others that we could mention, if we only had time to think of their many-syllabled names, have got up a very brilliant reputation on that score; now, why don't somebody chronicle the sufferings and endurance that we of the nineteenth century go through with, in the very same cause? The recital wouldn't probably be so romantic, but then it would be piercingly real!

"Remember, you are to come and take tea with me to-morrow evening!"

Shades of dyspepsia—omens of uncomfortable dreams—fearful certainty of pains under our belt-ribbons! what do people want to evince their desire of honoring you in this barbaric manner, for? And there is no creditable way of backing out of the dilemma; you can only smile a sickly assent, and submit. As ladies haven't the privilege of swearing, that mild remedy which so often mitigates the sufferings of their better halves is as a sealed book to them, and they endure in meek silence!

We would like to ask, what is the use of these stale banquets? Why won't some brave reformer uproot them from the face of the land? What have women, in the abstract, done, that when they go visiting anywhere, particularly in the rural districts, they should be immolated on the shrine of eating and drinking? Do people suppose that their honored guests live in a perpetual state of siege and starvation at

home? That may be a charitable supposition, but it certainly is not very complimentary!

And you have the satisfaction of knowing that all day long, your hostess—that is to be—is working herself into a fever over the cooking-stove and the pastry table, in order that she may have the triumph of placing one more kind of cake on her board than Mrs. Clark, where you took tea last night could "trump up." Of course, she has no kind of pity on your digestive apparatus; that don't enter into her calculations, at all. Three or four varieties of expensive jellies and sickeningly rich preserves—hot biscuits, and tea strong enough to blow the lid off from the tea-pot—and more kinds of cake than you had fancied could exist anywhere short of the Complete Cookery-Book—imagine such a display, in the fervid glow of an August evening, with a hospitable lady at its head, who will be mortally offended if you don't eat everything that is set before you!

Damon and Pythias were great friends—but if anything could have sundered the harmonious bonds of their affection, it would have been Damon's inviting Pythias "out to tea." Damon was very willing to die on the scaffold—that was a short and easy way out of the world—but we question whether ever he would have submitted to be killed by inches, with weapons of pound-cake and strawberry-jelly!

Dear women! you are always ready to listen to suggestions from one of your own band—do be sensible and give up this half-savage custom of entertaining your guest's stomachs instead of their brains! Let them come into your midst without being made uncomfortable by needless show and parade. It is only reasonable to suppose that they wish to enjoy your society instead of admiring your china and devouring dyspeptic sweets. Give them the benefit of the doubt, for mercy's sake! How often we have pitied your disappointment when, after having proclaimed the shining intellect and charming conversation of Mrs. Somebody to all your friends, you found her silent and uninteresting when the "showing-off" time came—you couldn't tell why; see can. Why, Madame de Stael herself couldn't have said a word, after passing through the ordeal of a New England tea-drinking!

Will you think over this matter, ladies? will you spare yourself and your friends these well-meant miseries? If not we humbly trust that you will never ask us, or any one in whom we have an interest, to "come to tea!" We had rather come to a dentist's chair, or a sewing society, or a Woman's Right's Convention, any time!

THE BOY THE FATHER OF THE MAN.

Solomon said, many centuries ago, "Even a child is known by his doings, whether his work be pure and whether it be right." Some people seems to think that children have no character at all. On the contrary, an observing eye sees in these young creatures the sign of what they are likely to be, for life.

When I see a boy in haste to spend every penny as soon as he gets it, I think it a sign that he will be a spendthrift.

When I see a boy hoarding up his pennies, and unwilling to part with them for any good purpose, I think it a sign that he will be a miser.

When I see a boy or girl always looking out for him or herself, and disliking to share good things with others, I think it a sign that the child will grow up a very selfish person.

When I see boys and girls often quarrelling, I think it a sign that they will be violent and hateful men and women.

When I see a little boy willing to taste strong drink, I think it a sign that he will be a drunkard.

When I see a boy who never attends to the service of religion, I think it a sign that he will be a profane and profligate man.

When I see a child obedient to his parents, I think it a sign of great future blessing from his Heavenly Parent.

And though great changes sometimes take place in the character, yet as a general rule, these signs do not fail.—*Juvenile Instructor.*

The condensed air of a crowded room gives a deposit which, if allowed to remain a few days, forms a solid, thick, glutinous mass, having a strong odor of animal matter. If examined by a microscope, it is seen to undergo a remarkable change. First of all, it is converted into a vegetable

growth, and this is followed by the production of multitudes of animalcules; a decisive proof that it must contain organic matter, otherwise it could not nourish organic beings.

CHEERFULNESS.—Try for a single day, I beseech you, to preserve yourself in an easy and cheerful frame of mind. Be, for one day, instead of a fire-worshipper of passion and hell, the sun-worshipper of clear self-possession; and compare the day in which you have rooted out the weed of dissatisfaction, with that on which you have allowed it to grow up—and you will find your heart open to every good motive, your life strengthened, and your breast armed with a panoply against every trick of fate; truly you will wonder at your own improvement.—*Richter.*

Give a man the necessities of life and he wants the conveniences and he craves for the luxuries. Grant him the luxuries and he sighs for the elegancies. Let him have the elegancies and he yearns for the follies. Give him altogether and he complains that he has been cheated both in price and quality of the articles.

TANNING SKINS WITH THE FUR ON.

MR. EDITOR: You gave a recipe in the Principia, not long since, to tan skins with the fur or wool on, and as I have had a lot of sheep skins to tan since, with the wool on, for winter mittens I tried part of them that way, and part of them my old way, with salt and alum; and I found my old way far, very far superior to that. The chalk process makes, poor, very poor leather indeed. I will give you my process, and you can publish it, if you desire it. I have used it for many years and do not find any other process that I have tried as good.

Take equal parts of salt and alum pulverized as fine as possible; and after removing all flesh and fat from the flesh side of the skin, sprinkle on it about four table spoons full of the mixture, (that is two of salt and two of alum) and rub it over well with the hand to make it touch every part. Then fold it lengthwise, the flesh sides together and let it lie about a day, then turn it over and let it lie on the other side about as long, then hang it up to dry; and when nearly dry, pull or rub it soft. If the skin has been dried after the animal was skinned, the skin before tanning must be soaked and worked in water till it is well softened before putting on the salt and alum. The above quantity is for a sheep skin of middling size; smaller or longer skins will need less or more, according to the size.

Two parts of salt petre and one part alum used as above makes good leather; but I think not as good as salt and alum.

I have found the chalk process (on skins that had been dried after taking off) a very poor way to tan, with the fur on.

WRITINGS OF WILLIAM GOODELL.

For sale at the office of the Principia: FOR CASH ONLY.
DEMOCRACY OF CHRISTIANITY, 2 Vols., \$1 50..... Postage 25c.
SLAVERY AND ANTI-SLAVERY (History of) 1 Vol., \$1 00 Postage 25c.
AMERICAN SLAVE CODE, 1 Vol., \$0 50..... Postage 15c.

OUR NATIONAL CHARTERS.

FOR THE MILLIONS.

I. The Federal Constitution of 1787-9.
II. The Articles of Confederation, 1778.
III. The Declaration of Independence, 1776.
IV. The Articles of Association, 1774.

With notes showing their bearing on slavery, and the relative powers of the State and National Governments. By WILLIAM GOODELL.

A summary of *Legal Rules of Interpretation and Legal opinions*, collected from the highest authorities, is prefixed to the Constitution. AN APPENDIX contains extracts from State Constitutions, and Bills of Rights—Ordinance of 1787, excluding slavery from the Northwest Territory; also, sentiments of the Revolutionary fathers, &c.

Price, Single Copies, 12 cents; if by mail, 15 cents, and at the same rate for any number short of 8 copies.

Eight copies, by mail, \$1.00, or 75 cents, at the Office.

Twelve copies, by mail, \$1.36, or \$1.00 at the Office.

Eighteen copies, by mail, \$2, or \$1.46 at the Office.

Twenty-seven copies, by mail, \$3, or \$2.19 at the Office.

For sale by WILLIAM GOODELL, or M. B. WILLIAMS, Office of the Principia, 339 Pearl Street, New York. TERMS, CASH, always in advance.

N.B. All postages on Books, Pamphlets, and Tracts, must be paid at our Post-Office in advance, so that we cannot answer orders as above, without having received the postage money, as well as the price of the publications.

Also, for sale as above,
Spooner's Unconstitutionality of Slavery,
In paper covers, price 75 cents, postage 13 cts.; in cloth, \$1.00, postage 15c.

We have no books, pamphlets, or tracts for sale, except those advertised, above, and it is not convenient for us to receive orders for any others.

D. D. NICHOLSON, PRINTER, 199 WILLIAM STREET, NEW YORK.